



## **National Commission on the Future of the Army**

2530 Crystal Drive, Zachary Taylor Building, Suite 5000  
Arlington, VA 22202

**SUBJECT:** Minutes from the Aviation Subcommittee Classified Meetings

**Date:** 17 and 18 August 2015

**Location:** 2530 Crystal Drive, Zachary Taylor Building 5th Floor, Arlington, VA

**Attendees:**

Commissioner Robert F. Hale, Aviation Subcommittee Chairman  
Commissioner Thomas R. Lamont, Aviation Subcommittee Member  
Commissioner Larry R. Ellis, Aviation Subcommittee Member  
Commissioner James D. Thurman, Aviation Subcommittee Member  
Mr. Don Tison, Commission Designated Federal Officer (DFO)  
MG (Ret) Ray Carpenter, NCFA Staff Executive Director  
LTC Steve Pierce, NCFA Staff, Aviation Subcommittee Co-Lead  
LTC Gregory Hartvigsen, NCFA Staff, Aviation Subcommittee Co-Lead  
LTC Sean Spence, NCFA Staff  
CPT Sarah Moore, NCFA Staff  
Mr. Anthony Boyda, NCFA Staff  
Mr. John Thurman, NCFA Staff  
Mr. Josh Klimas, RAND Cost Analyst  
Mr. Mark Pizzuto, Subcommittee Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

**Documents Submitted to Commission:** (1) TRAC sufficiency analysis and NCFA Staff and RAND cost estimate briefings (classified); (2) HQDA G8 FDV aviation modernization briefing

**Meeting Summaries**

**17 August 2015**

Mr. Mark Pizzuto, ADFO, called the meeting to order at 0730 hours by reviewing the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) with those in attendance. Subcommittee Chair Hale made opening remarks. This meeting included subject matter expert participants from the TRADOC Analysis Center (TRAC), RAND Corporation, HQDA G8 FDV, and retired senior Army leaders at various times.

TRAC. Mr. Brad Pippin, TRAC Analyst.

Mr. Pippin began his presentation at 0735 hours and briefed comparative sufficiency analysis of the Army's Aviation Restructure Initiative (ARI), the alternate National Guard Bureau (NGB) proposal, and other options undergoing feasibility assessment. He discussed variables and assumptions that materially affected the outcome of the modeling TRAC used to analyze various options. He also discussed multiple sets of

**SUBJECT:** Minutes from the Aviation Subcommittee Classified Meetings

predetermined business rules and how those sets of rules could affect outcomes. The subcommittee and Mr. Pippin also focused some discussion on risk and risk mitigation options. Some of the variables affecting risk are: supply, demand, attrition, capacity, training times, early warning, etc. Mr. Pippin closed at 0830 Hours by offering his assistance for additional coordination and analysis in the future if requested by NCFA Commissioners and was dismissed.

HQDA G8 FDV. COL Walter Rugen, Director, G8 FDV; Mr. Bill Pardue, Deputy Director, G8 FDV; LTC John Cochran, G8 FDV; Mr. Mark Riddle, UH-60 Staff Synchronization Officer (SSO), G8 FDV; and Mr. James St. Amour, AH-64 SSO, G8 FDV.

The DFO opened this part of the discussion by reviewing the requirements of the FACA with those in attendance. COL Rugen began at 0835 hours and provided a briefing on the Army Aviation portfolio budget and program (planned funding over next five years). He discussed historical levels of funding versus current funding and detailed further reductions that would occur under Budget Control Act sequestration mechanism. He outlined funding for all types of existing aircraft procurement, enablers (rockets and missiles, Aviation Survivability Equipment (ASE), avionics, etc.) and future programs (Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP), Future Vertical Lift (FVL), Degraded Visual Environment (DVE), etc.). He stressed the importance of continuing modernization of the aviation portfolio to provide the Army with the best aviation force possible with available resources.

The Aviation Subcommittee Chair thanked the briefers for their work and indicated they should expect continued dialogue and possible requests for further information in the future. The G8 FDV members were dismissed from the discussion at 0920 hours.

Senior Leader Panel. GEN (Ret) Richard Cody, LTG (Ret) Thomas Metz, MG (Ret) Rudolph Ostovich III, and MG (Ret) Jeffrey Schloesser.

The final topic for this portion of the meeting was a panel discussion with retired senior Army leaders. The panel members were selected based on their unique expertise in both operational and institutional activities for the Army. The DFO opened the panel at 0935 hours by reviewing the requirements of the FACA with those in attendance. To ensure transparency for everyone attending, panel members identified their business interests with defense industry. The panel discussion followed a Q&A format on topics that included capability of ARNG aviation units, aviation strategic depth, sustainable rotation rates, aviation depot level maintenance, and aviation manning, equipping, training and readiness.

The starting point was comparing the Army's decision to halt the Comanche aircraft program in order to free up near term funds for other aviation and munition programs with the current Aviation Restructure Initiative (ARI). Assessment was that the Comanche initiative set the strategic tone for ARI including the AH-64 discussion. This led to a discussion on transitioning AH-64 from the A model to the D model.

**SUBJECT:** Minutes from the Aviation Subcommittee Classified Meetings

The panel discussed the capability of active and ARNG units, both at pilot level and at battalion and brigade staff levels. Point was made that ARI is an equipping decision about lowering costs and not a decision about how the Army fights.

This led to a discussion focused on the relationship between modernization, readiness, and force structure. In short, trade-offs occur in the other two areas when you increase modernization, readiness, or force structure.

A short synopsis of the book, *An Army at Dawn*, was used as a conversation starter for the issue of acceptable BOG:Dwell time ratio. The point was made that there should be no mandated requirements for limits other than mission requirements.

The next topic discussed was the need for 24 attack aircraft per battalion. The early attempt by the Army within the modular restructuring initiative to field attack aviation battalions with only 18 or 21 attack aircraft did not go well in combat operations and the battalion organization was returned to 24 attack aircraft per battalion.

The last point made was that the large percentage of the Army's equipment budget goes to Aviation and that necessitates having a Major General on the Army Staff in the Pentagon representing those equities.

The panel concluded at 1050 hours and the subcommittee meeting was adjourned for the day with a reminder that the subcommittee would reconvene the next day at the same location.

**18 August 2015**

The Subcommittee Chairman called the meeting to order at 1600 hours. Only the subcommittee members and NCFA staff attended. The DFO reminded attendees that certain FACA provisions applied. There were no guest speakers or other participants for this continuation of the Aviation Subcommittee meeting. The Commissioners discussed ARI, the NGB proposal and other alternative options under feasibility review including the classified force sufficiency analysis. Aviation Subcommittee Commissioners and Staff discussed information presented in previous meetings and further refined information requirements needed to better understand details of all options available to them, including options beyond alternatives under feasibility review. The Commissioners accepted the cost estimation briefing slides and informed the RAND analyst and NCFA Staff to expect questions at a later meeting. The meeting concluded with the Subcommittee Chair tasking the NCFA Staff to further refine costing analysis of all options and begin developing products to enable discussion with the full Commission during the September 16-17, 2015 meetings. The meeting was adjourned at 1715 hours.